

**BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

The Wireline Competition Bureau	)	
Seeks Comments on the North American	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
Numbering Plan Administrator Technical	)	CC Docket No. 99-200
Requirements	)	

To: Wireline Competition Bureau

**COMMENTS OF VERIZON WIRELESS**

John T. Scott, III  
Vice President and Deputy General  
Counsel - Regulatory Law

Anne E. Hoskins  
Regulatory Counsel

Lolita D. Smith  
Associate Director Regulatory Matters

1300 I. St, N.W., Suite 400 West  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 589-3760

Its Attorneys

July 2, 2002

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Verizon Wireless recommends that the Bureau modify the NANPA Technical Requirements Document (“Requirements Document”) to promote improved NANP administration through enhanced NANPA performance. In section I, Verizon Wireless supports several substantive changes that would: 1) require applicants to develop a detailed neutrality policy that can be finalized and incorporated into the Requirements Document (after consultation with the NANC); 2) require increased accountability and timely information from NANPA; and 3) improve NANP administration by requiring certain process improvements. In section II, Verizon Wireless suggests editorial changes for improving the Requirements Document. Verizon Wireless urges the Bureau to adopt the requested changes.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO THE REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT ARE NEEDED .....	2
A.	Neutrality .....	3
B.	Access to Information/NRUF Analysis .....	6
C.	Process Improvements .....	9
II.	MINOR EDITS SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO THE FINAL REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT .....	12
III.	CONCLUSION .....	14

**BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

The Wireline Competition Bureau	)	
Seeks Comments on the North American	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
Numbering Plan Administrator Technical	)	CC Docket No. 99-200
Requirements	)	

To: Wireline Competition Bureau

**COMMENTS OF VERIZON WIRELESS**

Verizon Wireless hereby submits its comments on the requirements for the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (“NANPA”) that should be included in the NANPA Technical Requirements Document (“Requirements Document”), in response to the Wireline Competition Bureau’s (“Bureau”) request.<sup>1</sup> The specific obligations outlined in the Requirements Document will be used by the Bureau to prepare the solicitation for the next NANPA.<sup>2</sup>

The lengthy and exhaustive nature of the Requirements Document underscores the importance of NANPA’s role in NANP administration. The NANPA implements the federal numbering scheme for allocating numbering resources, recommends the initiation of NPA relief and facilitates the initial NPA relief planning meeting with the industry, provides valuable information regarding number utilization rates and trends, develops technology to facilitate its various functions, advises the North American Numbering

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Public Notice*, The Wireline Competition Bureau Seeks Comments on the North American Numbering Plan Administrator Technical Requirements, DA 02-1412, Released June 13, 2002.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* The Requirements Document defines NANPA’s technical, operational, and system requirements and describes the full functionality required.

Council (“NANC”), and collects and analyzes carrier-specific and industry numbering resource utilization and forecast data. Verizon Wireless recommends that the document: 1) require applicants to develop a detailed neutrality policy that can be finalized and incorporated into the Requirements Document (after consultation with the NANC); 2) require increased accountability and timely information from NANPA; and 3) improve NANP administration by requiring certain process improvements. These changes are addressed in section I. In section II, Verizon Wireless suggests editorial improvements to the Requirements Document.

#### **I. SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO THE REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT ARE NEEDED**

The next NANPA’s services can and should be improved in a number of key areas. The Requirements Document is the roadmap for NANPA applicants and forms the baseline for the next five-year NANPA contract. It is imperative that the Bureau improve NANP administration and NANPA performance through changes to the Requirements Document. The Requirements Document should be revised to require applicants to develop and adhere to a NANPA neutrality policy, further clarify requirements for the collection, analysis and dissemination of numbering resource optimization data, and require the implementation of certain process improvements. These measures should enhance the performance of the NANPA and provide needed assistance to carriers and regulators. Specific changes are discussed below.

### A. Neutrality

Paramount among statutory requirements for NANP administration is neutrality.<sup>3</sup> Section 251(e) requires the Commission to designate impartial entities to administer the NANP and to make telecommunications numbers available on an equitable basis.<sup>4</sup> While the Requirements Document states that neutral NANP administration is required, it does not itself provide or require applicants to develop a detailed neutrality policy.

The FCC's rules and orders governing the allocation of numbering resources provide limited guidance by defining when carriers are entitled to additional numbering resources and when resources may be denied.<sup>5</sup> However, there are other areas where the question of neutral NANP administration arises, specifically as it applies to NANPA. One such area is NANPA's role in NPA relief proceedings. For example, does NANPA have an advocacy role in state NPA relief and conservation proceedings? Today, NANPA is required by Section 5.1.3 to file the Initial Planning Document ("IPD") with a state commission. The IPD sets forth various relief alternatives, discusses the pros and cons of each, and identifies relief alternative(s) recommended by industry consensus, with supporting reasons.

Apart from this necessary function, Verizon Wireless believes that NANPA should not be authorized to comment on the desirability of proposed relief alternatives, including proposals to allow extended permissive dialing or wireless grandfathering coincident with geographic splits, even at the request of a state regulatory commission.

---

<sup>3</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 251(e).

<sup>4</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 251(e). The FCC recognized this requirement in its *Public Notice*. See *Public Notice*, The Wireline Competition Bureau Seeks Comments on the North American Numbering Plan Administrator Technical Requirements, DA 02-1412, Released June 13, 2002 (citing 47 U.S.C. § 251(e)).

<sup>5</sup> See *Numbering Resource Optimization, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 15 FCC Rcd. 7574 (2000), at ¶¶ 84, 92, 96-104. See *Numbering Resource Optimization*,

Such activity is not neutral since it goes beyond the industry consensus process and effectively puts NANPA in the position of siding with some parties and opposing others in the area code relief docket.<sup>6</sup> State NPA relief decisions – including whether to grandfather wireless NXX codes or allow an extended permissive dialing period to reprogram consumers’ handsets – directly affect carriers’ ability to obtain new numbering resources in a timely manner and the costs associated with implementing area code relief.

Moreover, the Requirements Document should provide that NANPA not comment on the desirability of technology-specific overlays. By definition, TSOs foster inequitable access to numbering resources, by limiting affected carriers’ ability to obtain numbers from a particular NPA. A TSO can include taking back numbering resources from wireless carriers. Take-backs are anti-competitive, discriminatory and would cause great inconveniences to wireless carriers and consumers.

Additionally, the Bureau should ensure that if the company serving as the NANPA also serves as the pooling administrator (“PA”) and/or the number portability administration center (“NPAC”) (collectively, “Administrators”), that procedures are in place to mitigate the inherent conflicts between the Administrators’ responsibilities and the financial rewards derived from those responsibilities.

Specifically, each Administrator has separate but related functions, which provide financial benefits and promote different financial interests. The PA receives compensation for: the initial pooling implementation meeting, pool establishment, and

---

*Third Report and Order and Second Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-98 and CC Docket No. 99-200*, 17 FCC Rcd. 252 (2001) at ¶ 98.

<sup>6</sup> Section 5 of the Requirements Document governs NANPA’s role in NPA Relief Planning. While Section 5 contemplates a proactive NANPA role and possible NANPA testimony, on an enterprise basis, it is clear that such activities are designed to facilitate the industry consensus process or to provide information to regulators regarding the relief plan. Section 5.1.7 expressly requires a neutral facilitator role for NANPA.

each batch of one hundred Part 3 confirmation forms which document the assignment of one hundred thousands-blocks to the industry. The PA has a financial interest in maximizing participation in thousands-block number pooling. The NPAC assesses transaction charges for any ported telephone numbers or porting activity that touches the NPAC. The NPAC has a financial interest in maximizing the amount of porting, including supporting certain conservation measures like Unassigned Number Porting (UNP) and Individual Telephone Number Pooling (ITN). NANPA receives payments under its contract for participating in area code relief proceedings and the various activities defined by the Requirements Document. These various roles and the corresponding financial incentives are not all aligned.

Consequently, if the same company serves as with the NANPA and the PA, it may have an overall financial interest in promoting pooling over area code relief, including supporting the donation of blocks with a higher “contamination” level than presently required.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, if the same company serving as the NANPA also serves as the NPAC, it may have an overall financial interest in supporting number portability and the development of controversial methods like UNP and ITN over traditional area code relief.<sup>8</sup> In order for the NANPA to retain credibility as a provider of objective data and

---

<sup>7</sup> The President of the California Public Utilities Commission proposed higher contamination levels at a Congressional hearing on area code relief last week. Many in the industry would not support such a change in the pooling rules or guidelines. The Requirements Document should prevent NANPA from being drawn into policy debates such as this one, and limit its role to providing facts that only it can provide.

<sup>8</sup> Similarly, Verizon Wireless notes with concern that the current NANPA participated in a NARUC-sponsored closed-door advocacy session with Congressional staffers in the fall of 2001. The purpose of the meeting was to build support for NARUC’s opposition to the Verizon Wireless Petition for Forbearance from the wireless LNP mandate. Wireless carriers were not allowed to attend or participate in the briefing during NANPA’s presentation, nor at any other point. The NPAC function, which in this case is performed by the same company that also serves as the NANPA, has a direct financial interest in the outcome of the forbearance proceeding. This and similar situations undermine the important principle that the NANPA be neutral. The Requirements Document should expressly prohibit advocacy by the NANPA.



information, procedures must be in place to safeguard against financial conflicts of interest.

The existing NANPA has formulated a complaint process by which aggrieved service providers can lodge complaints of alleged discriminatory conduct or favoritism against the company. However, that process is internal to NANPA and does not create any legal rights under the Communications Act nor the FCC's rules. Further, it does not address the issues raised above regarding neutrality.

The FCC should require bidding companies to develop a neutrality policy as part of their application. Section 1 of the Requirements Document should be rewritten to: (1) require submission of a neutrality policy; (2) indicate that the proposed neutrality policy will be finalized during consultations between the Bureau and the NANC; and (3) indicate that the final policy will be incorporated into the Requirements Document. This will enable the Bureau to incorporate more specific neutrality guidelines into the Requirements Document that should confer legal rights to the industry and establish penalties under the NANPA contract. Moreover, the Requirements Document should require applicants with (or bidding on) other telecommunications industry service contracts, including but not limited to the PA and the NPAC, to state how they will avoid financial conflicts and otherwise maintain neutrality.

#### **B. Access to Information/NRUF Analysis**

Several sections of the Requirements Document concern NANPA's role as a repository of number resource utilization and forecast data and its responsibility to advise

regulators and industry about numbering issues and potential resource exhaust.<sup>9</sup> The Bureau should modify the Requirements Document in the following respects:

**Section 2.1.2:** provides a general description of the functions to be performed by NANPA to accommodate numbering needs at the NPA and NANP levels. In addition to its assignment and administrative activities, NANPA must implement a mechanism to provide information on the availability of numbering resources to meet current and future needs.<sup>10</sup> NANPA's website provides valuable information regarding the status of various area codes, including the disposition of area code relief proceedings. However, Verizon Wireless has found it difficult to obtain information regarding true carrier demand for scarce numbering resources. A key data point for determining the necessity for NPA relief is the rate of actual carrier demand relative to the number of remaining codes. The number of codes remaining is meaningless without the actual demand rate.

NANPA often provides the rationed demand, which does indicate the amount of pent-up demand. Given that a number of states continue to use rationing to extend the NPA exhaust date artificially by denying numbers to carriers with demonstrable need, the NANPA data understates the true extent to which carriers need numbers to serve customers. This section should be written to require NANPA to provide the actual demand rate.

**Section 6.3.1.3:** allows NANPA to base NPA exhaust projections only on rationed demand. Specifically, this provision states that the rationed amount will have a significant and direct effect on the life of the NPA, regardless of forecasted demand and that in such cases, all other elements may be rendered irrelevant. As noted above, rationed amounts *artificially* extend the life of an NPA by employing a lottery scheme to allocate only the prescribed rationed amount of

---

<sup>9</sup> Requirements Document at §§ 2.1.2, 6.1-6.4.

<sup>10</sup> Requirements Document at § 2.1.2.

NXX codes in a given month.<sup>11</sup> Regulators cannot have a complete understanding of the dire need for imminent relief if NANPA's exhaust projection is only based on rationing and if actual demand is deemed irrelevant. This section should be written to require NANPA to also provide NPA exhaust projections based on the actual demand rate.

**Sections 6 and 6.1.6:** After carriers' NRUF filings are made twice annually, NANPA must compile, examine, and analyze the data gathered from these reports and submit its analysis to the NANC, the FCC and state regulatory commissions that request it, semi-annually on the last business day of April and October of each year, unless otherwise directed by the FCC.<sup>12</sup> Carrier NRUF submissions are filed by February 1 and August 1 of each year, and incorporate data as of December 31 and June 30 respectively. This year, NANPA's report to the NANC analyzing the February 1 NRUF filings was provided to the NANC in late May.<sup>13</sup> At this rate, by the time the data is analyzed and reported on to the NANC, the underlying data is almost six months old and provides little value beyond an historical snapshot. The industry and regulators cannot respond quickly to emerging trends if the NANPA's report is stale upon arrival.

Carriers and NANPA alike have gained experience with NRUF. Mistakes in filings have declined dramatically since the first NRUF reports. Now, NANPA provides notices of some errors in carriers' submissions by the end of February and the end of August. However, notices of NRUF anomalies are sometimes provided much later. NANPA should be required by this section to provide all notices of errors and anomalies within 30 days. Carriers can then submit corrected data quickly. Even if not all corrected data has been provided to NANPA, NANPA should nevertheless provide a report of the NRUF data within

---

<sup>11</sup> Essentially, carriers with legitimate requests for additional resources may have their numbering needs unmet if they do not prevail in the lottery. Carriers whose need for numbers reach critical stages are then forced to request emergency relief outside of the lottery.

<sup>12</sup> Requirements Document at § 6.

60 days of the initial NRUF submission date. If material errors in a number of carriers' submissions have corrupted the report, and/or corrected data has not been submitted quickly enough, NANPA can reform/amend its report at the time of the next report or at anytime between the 60 day cut-off and the next report.

### **C. Process Improvements**

The Requirements Document provides for the transition to the successor NANPA.<sup>14</sup> The next NANPA term commences in February, 2003.<sup>15</sup> While the Commission has the option to extend the present NANPA's contract for another five-year term, a new NANPA also may be selected.

In the latter case, it is critical that there be a substantial training/transition period. Carriers' NRUF submissions must be filed February 1, 2003, and will require the NANPA's immediate attention. Currently, the NANPA generates notices of errors in the submissions by the end of February so that carriers can submit corrected data.

Section 2.15.4 requires NANPA to provide a detailed transition plan 180 calendar days before contract termination, which should be submitted in August of this year.<sup>16</sup> The Bureau must ensure that the transition plan provides enough detail and allows for enough training to prepare the next NANPA to handle, among other things, the February 2003 NRUF. The Requirements Document and/or the NANPA contract should provide for penalties if the outgoing NANPA fails to provide a timely and adequate transition plan.

---

<sup>13</sup> NANPA indicated that it needed additional time to project NPA and NANPA exhaust to include the impact of wireless participation in number pooling. The completed national pooling rollout schedule was not released until April 24, 2002.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at § 2.15.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at § 1.1.

<sup>16</sup> The industry should be given an opportunity to comment on the proposed transition plan.

Section 4 of the Requirements Document focuses on the Code Administration System (“CAS”). The current CAS change management plan is unduly cumbersome. For example, whenever there is a change to the industry guidelines that requires NANPA to add or delete a field within the CAS database, the NANPA seeks an adjustment to its Statement of Work or a “change order” from the FCC before undertaking the necessary software change. NANPA should be required to formulate a simpler process and should make changes to the CAS either on a monthly or quarterly basis. Given the dynamic nature of the numbering guidelines, the CAS database and the associated forms should be changeable without undue expense and delays. Changes to the CAS that require minimal software changes should become a routine procedure for the NANPA, fully provided for in the fixed price contract, without the delay and expense associated with current practices.

NPA Relief Planning is discussed in Section 5 of the Requirements Document. This section should require the NANPA to keep the PA informed of relief activities. The PA needs to be kept abreast of the status of relief proceedings and the availability of numbers for the pools.

Further, NANPA should do more industry coordination during NPA relief proceedings by conducting regular implementation meetings through the life cycle of the project. Currently, NANPA conducts only the initial meeting. As the neutral NANP administrator, NANPA should monitor and facilitate NPA relief until implementation is complete. NANPA’s involvement is necessary to drive implementation activities to efficient and timely completion and to impartially document obstacles or mediate misunderstandings between carriers. Further, coordination by NANPA beyond the initial

meeting should improve the odds that difficult relief projects receive the attention and focus they require from all necessary parties. Specifically, Section 5.1.12 should be changed as follows:

*NANPA, as a neutral third party, shall schedule implementation meetings once a form of relief has been selected and ordered by a state regulator.*

*Regular meetings for NPA Splits should be conducted by this neutral third party, which addresses the following:*

- Establish contact list of names and numbers for each carrier involved in the NPA Split.
- Coordinate the timeline when the switches will be converted to the New NPA.
- Coordinate the timeline when the 911 LEC changes the database for all 911 records.
- Coordinate the timeline when the impacted carriers will change their ANI (Automatic Number Identification).
- Convene regular calls during the conversions from permissive to mandatory to post mandatory dialing.

*Regular meetings for NPA Overlays should be conducted by this neutral third party, which addresses the following:*

- Establish contact list of names and numbers for each carrier involved in the NPA Overlay.
- Coordinate the timeline when the switches will be open to the New NPA in the Overlay Area.
- Coordinate the 7 to 10 digit dialing conversion.
- Convene regular calls during the conversions from permissive to mandatory to post mandatory dialing.

NANPA's involvement with NPA relief projects in this manner will facilitate NPA relief implementation activities in cooperation with the industry and the state regulatory authority.

## II. MINOR EDITS SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO THE FINAL REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENT

Verizon Wireless offers the following editorial comments and suggestions for improving the Requirements Document:

- **BIRRDS, not RDBS, BRIDS nor BRADS:** a global change is needed to replace all of the references to RDBS, BRIDS and BRADS with the BIRRDS acronym. BIRRDS is the Business Integrated Rating and Routing Database System developed by Telcordia that replaced the other systems.
- **Deletion:** In Section 4.2.1, Client Services, there is a list of the various forms carriers use in connection with their code applications. The reference to a “Part 5” form whereby NANPA confirms receipt of the Part 4 form is unnecessary. NANPA confirms receipt of Part 4 forms via a generic email to the particular carrier. There is no Part 5 form in the INC CO Code Assignment Guidelines.
- **Refer to the INC Guidelines:** In several places in Section 4, the Requirements Document refers to the INC CO Code Assignment guidelines but then lists outdated information. The INC Guidelines will change numerous times during the tenure of the NANPA contract. In sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, the Requirements Document should refer to the INC Guidelines and delete the listed information. Section 6.1.10 should reference the INC Guidelines. Sections 4, 5, and 6 of the INC Guidelines concern processing code requests from carriers that do not have an NRUF on file or that file NRUF data after the deadline.
- **Timeframes:** The Bureau has inserted specific timeframes in certain sections of the document. Verizon Wireless has identified other places where specific timeframes would be prudent: 1) section 4.2.1, the reference to a transition period; 2) section 7.19.5, system responsiveness (NANPA should respond within two hours during normal business hours and otherwise within one business day); 3) sections 9.1.3, 9.1.4, and 9.4 should all have timeframes associated with NANPA’s audits and

performance measures; and 4) section 6.3.3 should specify a timeframe or a date for NANPA to identify anomalies and trends in numbering usage.

- **List Audited Items:** Section 11.3 provides for an audit of NANPA's enterprise services. The Bureau should list the audit performance measurements such as NANPA's adherence to industry guidelines, accurate billing, and fair and reasonable pricing.
- **Miscellaneous:** Section 11.4 refers to a Section 14.1, which does not exist in this version of the document. Section 4.4 states that NANPA shall send an email to confirm every CO Code application received. NANPA should also be required to send a facsimile to those companies without electronic capabilities. The Bureau should require the NANPA to implement back-up system capabilities in connection with Sections 7.2 and 7.3.1. Lastly, in the event of a disaster, NANPA's recovery of its costs pursuant to Section 7.13 to rebuild systems, records, and related information should not be borne by the industry.



### III. CONCLUSION

The Bureau should make substantive and editorial changes to the Requirements Document as outlined above. These measures will improve NANPA performance and consequently, NANP administration.

Respectfully submitted,

VERIZON WIRELESS

By: John T. Scott, III

John T. Scott, III  
Vice President and Deputy General  
Counsel - Regulatory Law

Anne E. Hoskins  
Regulatory Counsel

Lolita D. Smith  
Associate Director Regulatory Matters

1300 I St, N.W., Suite 400 West  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 589-3760

Its Attorneys

July 2, 2002